	Oocument 1	Filed 07/07/2004	Page 1 of 12
RECEIPT # 5705 (9			
AMOUNT & 150			
SUMMONS ISSUED X-1		gires ju-s	HLED
OCAL RULE 4.1 UNITED ST	TATES DISTE	RICT COURT [[ CLE	RKZ DEFICE
WAIVER TORM FOR THE DIST	TRICT OF MA	SSACHUSETTS	THE CHARLE
MCF (SSUED		2004 JUL	-7 P 2: 3b
PATE 1-7-09			
		3. DIS	TRICT COURT
	)	J21Kir	CT OF MASS.
STEVEN R. KINCAID,	)		
	)		
Plaintiff,	)		
VS.	)	Civil Action No.	
	)		
DANIZ OF AMEDICA CODDODAT	)	COMPLAINT AND	TI TO SZ
BANK OF AMERICA CORPORAT	ion, )	COMPLAINT AND CO	JUKY
Defendant.	)	DEMIAND	
	)		

# 04cv11522 JLT

#### NATURE OF THE ACTION

MAGISTRATE JUDGE Colen

1. This is an employment termination action brought under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended, 29 U.S.C. §621 et seq. (ADEA) for unlawful discrimination and retaliation; and for wrongful discharge in violation of public policy and breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing under state law.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. This Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiff's federal law claims under 28 U.S.C. §1331 and supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's pendant state law claims under 28 U.S.C. §1367(a).
- 3. Plaintiff has complied with all conditions precedent to the filing of this action:

- a. On July 25, 2003, Plaintiff filed a timely charge of employment discrimination on the bases of age and retaliation with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).
- b. On April 8, 2004, Plaintiff received a Notice of Right to Sue issued by the EEOC.
- c. This complaint is filed within ninety (90) days of Plaintiff's receipt of the EEOC's Notice of Right to Sue.
- 4. Plaintiff resides, and Defendant maintains offices and conducts substantial business, within the District of Massachusetts. Venue therefore is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§1391(b) and (c).

#### **PARTIES**

- 5. Plaintiff Steven R. Kincaid is a citizen of the United States and resides at 8 Towne Lane, Topsfield, Massachusetts.
  - 6. Plaintiff's date of birth is July 19, 1953.
- 7. At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiff was and is a member of the class of persons protected by the ADEA.
- 8. Upon information and belief, Defendant Bank of America Corporation is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business located at 201 North Tryon Street, Charlotte, North Carolina.
- 9. Upon information and belief, Defendant owns and operates more than 250 banking centers and more than 1290 automated teller machines (ATMs) within the District of Massachusetts.
  - 10. Defendant is engaged in an industry affecting commerce.

- 11. Defendant employs twenty (20) or more employees.
- 12. Defendant is an employer within the meaning of §11(b) of the ADEA, 29 U.S.C. §630(b).

#### **FACTS**

- 13. In and before 2002, Plaintiff operated a consulting business located at 11 Carleton Circle, Boxford, Massachusetts, where Plaintiff also resided.
- 14. In or around the spring of 2002, a management recruiting firm contacted Plaintiff at his Massachusetts office/residence for the purpose of recruiting Plaintiff for employment with Defendant.
- 15. Thereafter, the recruiter and representatives of Defendant interviewed Plaintiff in telephone conferences placed to Plaintiff's office/residence in Massachusetts. Defendant also paid for Plaintiff to travel to North Carolina for in-person interviews.
- 16. In or around July 2002, Defendant offered Plaintiff a position as Vice President, Market Information Manager in Charlotte, North Carolina. The offer was extended through a telephone call placed to Plaintiff's office/residence in Massachusetts and confirmed in a letter sent to Plaintiff in Massachusetts.
- 17. In seeking to persuade Plaintiff to relocate from Massachusetts to North Carolina and thereby obtain for itself a statistical analysis methodology Plaintiff had developed, Defendant promised Plaintiff long-term employment and fair treatment free of unlawful discrimination.
- 18. The recruiter asked Plaintiff if he would be comfortable reporting to someone with less experience.

- 19. Defendant advised Plaintiff he would have three primary projects: to develop a definition of customer loyalty, to develop a statistical driver monograph, and to develop a means of valuing loyalty.
- 20. Defendant promised to continue to employ Plaintiff in a position commensurate with his experience and background once the primary projects were completed.
- 21. In reliance on Defendant's promises, Plaintiff relocated to North Carolina and commenced employment with Defendant on or about August 20, 2002.
- 22. Plaintiff's area of expertise was and is the design and overhaul of methodology used to perform statistical analyses. Plaintiff's first assignment after commencing employment with Defendant was to create a statistical driver monograph detailing this methodology.
- 23. Plaintiff's immediate supervisor was Sheila Burroughs (Burroughs). Upon information and belief, during the time Plaintiff was employed by Defendant, Ms. Burroughs was approximately 33 years old.
- 24. Burroughs and other management directed Plaintiff to write the monograph "as if he would be hit by a bus" as soon as it was completed.
- 25. Plaintiff began writing the monograph and working on the definition of loyalty project soon after beginning his employment with Defendant.
  - 26. Plaintiff completed the monograph in or around January 2003.
- 27. Between Plaintiff's date of hire and the date on which he completed the monograph, Burroughs praised Plaintiff's work performance as excellent and did not, on any occasion, criticize any substantive aspect of Plaintiff's performance.

- 28. After completing the monograph, and performing substantial work on the loyalty definition project, and after Defendant had obtained the benefit of Plaintiff's years of experience, knowledge, and expertise, Burroughs' approach to Plaintiff and his work performance changed dramatically.
- 29. Burroughs began harassing Plaintiff and giving him conflicting instructions in an effort to ensure that Plaintiff would be unable to meet his 2003 performance goals. For example:
  - a. Burroughs delayed release of the statistical driver monograph for more than ten weeks after its completion, thus preventing Plaintiff from demonstrating his leadership and consulting skills on the main project in which he was engaged.
  - b. Burroughs ordered Plaintiff not to attempt to lead the loyalty valuation work, then improperly criticized him for not showing "ability to lead the valuation topic."
  - c. Burroughs ignored or rejected Plaintiff's suggestions relating to, for example, scales in measurement and customer satisfaction surveys, then improperly criticized him for failing to exhibit and communicate strategic thinking.
  - d. Burroughs ordered Plaintiff not to engage other financial staff in the definition of loyalty project, saying she wished to do so herself. She failed to follow through at all, making it impossible for Plaintiff to complete the project. Burroughs then criticized Plaintiff for not concluding the project.

- e. When Plaintiff requested time off to attend his grandmother's funeral in Oklahoma, Burroughs set an arbitrary deadline for a small work project and made it clear that he would not be able to complete the work on time if he attended the funeral.
- 30. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff was the oldest employee, and most highly compensated employee at his level, in his department.
- 31. Upon information and belief, Defendant, having obtained Plaintiff's unique methodology, began harassing Plaintiff in an attempt to force him to resign and thereby rid itself of an older, highly compensated employee.
- 32. Upon information and belief, Defendant's treatment of Plaintiff was consistent with its pattern of forcing the resignations of other employees in the protected age group.
- 33. Upon information and belief, Defendant had a practice of firing older workers to manipulate earning results and to avoid the severance payments and financial accountability that would accompany layoffs.
- 34. By letter dated April 25, 2003, Plaintiff, through his counsel, registered a written discrimination complaint with J. Steele Alphin, Corporate Personnel Executive for Defendant.
- 35. By letter dated April 30, 2003, Eric A. Montgomery, Assistant General Counsel for Defendant, acknowledged receipt of Plaintiff's complaint and advised, "We are investigating the facts and circumstances of your client's claim and will respond to your letter shortly."

- 36. Defendant never responded to Plaintiff's complaint. Upon information and belief, Defendant did not conduct any investigation into Plaintiff's discrimination claims.
- 37. Instead, Defendant terminated Plaintiff's employment, without notice or cause, on June 13, 2003. Upon information and belief, Defendant retained younger, less qualified similarly situated employees who had not complained of discrimination.
- 38. Upon information and belief, Defendant harassed and discharged Plaintiff because of Plaintiff's age, in retaliation for Plaintiff's complaint of unlawful discrimination, in violation of public policy, and in violation of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.
- 39. In engaging in the acts described above, Defendant acted knowingly, willfully, and maliciously.
- 40. As a result of Defendant's acts as described above, Plaintiff has suffered damage, including without limitation: termination of employment; deprivation of income and benefits; loss of future earning capacity; loss of future income and benefits; damage to career and reputation; and pain and suffering, emotional distress, and mental anguish.

# COUNT ONE AGE DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF 29 U.S.C. §621 *ET SEQ*.

- 41. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 40 above as if fully set forth herein.
- 42. Defendant harassed Plaintiff and terminated Plaintiff's employment because of Plaintiff's age.

- 43. Defendant's termination of Plaintiff because of his age violated §4(a)(1) of the ADEA, 29 U.S.C. §623(a)(1).
- 44. Defendant's discrimination against Plaintiff was willful and undertaken with malice and reckless indifference to Plaintiff's federally protected rights.
- 45. As a result of Defendant's unlawful acts, Plaintiff has been damaged as described above.

# COUNT TWO RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF 29 U.S.C. §623(d)

- 46. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 45 above as if fully set forth herein.
- 47. Defendant harassed Plaintiff and terminated Plaintiff's employment because Plaintiff opposed Defendant's discriminatory practices and because of Plaintiff's assertion of his rights under the ADEA, in violation of §4(d) of the ADEA, 29 U.S.C. §623(d).
- 48. As a result of Defendant's unlawful acts, Plaintiff has been damaged as described above.

# COUNT THREE WRONGFUL DISCHARGE IN VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY

- 49. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 48 above as if fully set forth herein.
- 50. Defendant's harassment of Plaintiff and termination of Plaintiff's employment violated public policy as set forth in the North Carolina Equal Employment

Practices Act, Ch. 143, Secs.143-422.1 through 143-422.3 of the North Carolina General Statutes, and in the North Carolina Retaliatory Employment Discrimination Law, Ch. 95, Sec. 95-240 through 95-245 of the North Carolina General Statutes.

Page 9 of 12

51. As a result of Defendant's unlawful acts, Plaintiff has been damaged as described above.

#### COUNT FOUR BREACH OF THE IMPLIED COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING

- 52. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 51 above as if fully set forth herein.
- 53. Defendant's acts as described above breached the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing that existed in Plaintiff's at-will employment contact.
- 54. As a result of Defendant's unlawful acts, Plaintiff has been damaged as described above.

**WHEREFORE,** Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court award the following relief:

- Judgment declaring that Defendant's acts violated Plaintiff's rights as secured by applicable federal and state laws;
- Damages to make Plaintiff whole, including but not limited to back pay with interest, adjusted for any increase Plaintiff would have received had he not been unlawfully terminated; reimbursement of Plaintiff's lost benefits and replacement costs; and reimbursement for medical, relocation, and other costs

resulting from Plaintiff's termination, all in an amount to be determined at trial;

- 3) Front pay in lieu of reinstatement;
- Compensatory damages, including but not limited to emotional distress, pain 4) and suffering, and mental anguish; and relocation, job search, business development, and other damages incurred by Plaintiff as a result of his unlawful termination.
- Punitive damages in an amount not less than \$5,000,000; 5)
- Liquidated damages for Defendant's willful violation of the ADEA; 6)
- Attorneys' fees, interest, costs, and disbursements; and 7)
- Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper. 8)

# PLAINTIFF REQUESTS TRIAL BY JURY

Plaintiff.

STEVEN R. KINCAID

By his attorneys,

Ash Harkary John B. Harkavy, Esquire, BBO No. 541900

BERNKOPF GOODMAN LLP

125 Summer Street, Suite 1300

Boston, Massachusetts 02110

Telephone:

(617) 790-3000

Facsimile:

(617) 790-3300

Of Counsel:

DEBORAH MARTIN NORCROSS, ESQ.

60 Marion Road West

Princeton, New Jersey 08540

Telephone:

(609) 279-0191

Facsimile:

(609) 279-0526

(Motion for Admission Pro Hac Vice to be Filed)

#294004 v1/99999/1

Dated: July 6, 2004

SJS 44 (Rev. 3/99)

### CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filling and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the Unfied States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDAN	NTS	
Steven R. Ki	ncaid		Bank o	F America Corpo	ration
(b) County of Residence (E.	of First Listed PlaintiffXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		County of Resid	ISTRICT COURT page of First line ASS. (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CAS ND CONDEMNATION CASES, ID DINVOLVED.	SES ONLY) USE THE LOCATION OF THE
(c) Attorney's (Firm Nam	me, Address, and Telephone Number)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Attorneys (If K	nown)	
John Harkavy, Esq. 125 Summer Str., 13	Bernkopf Goodman LLP 3th Fl., Boston MA 02110 617-79	90-3000	_		
Deborah Martin Nord 60 Marion Rd. West,	ross, Esq. Princeton, NJ 08540 609-27	79-0191	U4CV	1152	2 11.7
II. BASIS OF JURISI	OICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITI (For Di	ZENSHIP OF I	PRINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for De fendant)
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			DEF 1 1 Incorporated or of Business	Principal Place 4 4
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citi zenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen	of Another State		nd Principal Place ☐ 5 <b>X</b> 5 In Another State
				3 □ 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	rorei	gn Country		
CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFE	TTURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment Æ En forcement of □ !ssdsmestcare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability  REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Force losure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	Slander   368 Asbestos Person Injury Product Liability   340 Ma rine   FERSONAL PROPER   370 Other Fraud   371 Truth in Lending   375 M otor V chicle   Product Liability   380 Other Personal   Property Damage   Product Liability   385 Property Damage   385 Property Damage   385 Property Damage   Product Liability   Sentence   441 Voting   510 M otions to Vacat   Sentence   443 Housing   444 Welfare   530 General   444 Welfare   444 Other Civil Rights   535 De ath Penalty   440 Other Civil Rights   540 Mandamus & Other Civil Righ		LABOR Fair Labor Sandards Act	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158  □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157  PROPERTY RIGHTS  □ 820 Co pyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trad emark  SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 H IA (13 95ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIW C/DIW W (405 (g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405 (g))  FEDERAL TAXSUITS □ 870 T axes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	400 State Reap portionment   410 Antitust   430 Banks and Banking   450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc.   460 Deportation   470 Racke teer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations   810 Selective Service   850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange   875 Customer C hallenge   12 USC 3410   891 Agricultural Acts   892 Economic Stabilization Act   893 Environmental Matters   894 Energy Allocation Act   895 Freedom of Information Act   900 App cal of Fee Determent Equal Access to Justice   950 Constitutionality of State Statues
	☐ 550 Civit Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition		Security Act	26 USC 7609	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions
X 1 Original □ 2 Re Proceeding St	ate Court Appellate Court	A Reinstate	ed or 12 5 (specify	erred from r district r)	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Do not cite jurisd ictional statutes unless diversity	1			
age precrimina	tion in Employment Act of	1967 f	or unlawful	discrimination	and retaliation
VII. REQUESTED IN	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTIO	N DEMA	ND S	CHECK YES only	if demanded in complaint:
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	ro be de	etermined	JURY DEMAND:	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	E(S) instructions):  JUDG E			DOCKET NUMBER	
July 7, 2004	SIGNATURE OF ATT	ORNEY OF RE	CORD		
OR OFFICE USE ONLY	Can Ison				
RECEIPT # A	MOUN APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JUDO	GE

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Catego	ory in whic	th the case belongs based upon the nu	mbered nature of su	rit code his	ted on the Ci	viľcoversheet.	(See
	ule 40.1(a)						
	I.	160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARDLESS (	F NATURE OF SUIT	1.5.01	STRICT C ICT OF M	COURT	
XX	II.	195, 368, 400, 440, 441-444, 540, 5 740, 790, 791, 820°, 830°, 840°, 850		20, 730,	*Also con	nplete AO 120 or t, trademark or co	
	III.	110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 190, 210, 2 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 355, 3 380, 385, 450, 891.		-			
	IV.	220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 510, 530, 6	10. 620. 630. 640. 6	50. 660.			
		690, 810, 861-865, 870, 871, 875, 9			<b>**</b>	FOO	WW
			UZ	- CV	STATE OF THE PARTY	522	
<u></u>	٧.	150, 152, 153.					
	strict plea	se indicate the title and number of the t	irst filed case in this	court.			
Has a	prior actio	n between the same parties and based	on the same claim	ever been	filed in this	court?	
				YES	NO	XXX	
	_	int in this case question the constitution	nality of an act of co	ongress at	fecting the p	ublic interest? (	See
28 USC	C §2403)				<b></b>	3q	
				YES	NO	XXX	
If so, is	s the U.S.	A. or an officer, agent or employee of th	e U.S. a party?				
				YE\$	NO		
ls this	case regu	ired to be heard and determined by a d	istrict court of three	iudaes pi	ursuant to titl	e 28 USC \$2284?	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<del>-</del>	3			
				VE0		xxx	
				YES	☐ NO	xxx	
Do <u>all</u> Massa	chusetts	ies in this action, excluding governme "governmental agencies"), residing in		united sta	ates and the C		
Do <u>all</u> Massa	chusetts			united sta	ates and the C	n? - (See Local I	
Do <u>all</u>	chusetts		Massachusetts res	united sta ide in the YES	ates and the C same divisio	n? - (See Local I	
Do <u>all</u> Massa	chusetts ( ).	"governmental agencies"), residing in	Massachusetts res	united sta ide in the YES	ates and the C same divisio NO eside?	n? - (See Local I	
Do <u>all</u> Massa	chusetts ( ).	"governmental agencies"), residing in If yes, in which division do <u>all</u> of th	Massachusetts research e non-governmental Central Division ity of the plaintiffs o	united statide in the  YES  parties re	ates and the ( same divisio  NO side?  Wester	n? - (See Local i	Rule
Do <u>all</u> Massa	chusetts ( ). A.	"governmental agencies"), residing in  If yes, in which division do <u>all</u> of th  Eastern Division  If no, in which division do the major	Massachusetts research e non-governmental Central Division ity of the plaintiffs o	united statide in the  YES  parties re	ates and the C same divisio NO eside? Wester parties, exclu	n? - (See Local i	Rule
Do <u>all</u> Massa 40.1(d)	chusetts ( ). A. B.	"governmental agencies"), residing in  If yes, in which division do_all of th  Eastern Division  If no, in which division do the major  agencies, residing in Massachuse	e non-governmental Central Division ity of the plaintiffs of tts reside? Central Division	united stated in the YES parties re	ates and the C same divisio NO side? Wester parties, exclu	n? - (See Local i	Rule
Do <u>all</u> Massa 40.1(d)	chusetts ( ). A. B.	"governmental agencies"), residing in  If yes, in which division do all of th  Eastern Division  If no, in which division do the major  agencies, residing in Massachuser  Eastern Division XXX	e non-governmental Central Division ity of the plaintiffs of tts reside? Central Division	united stated in the YES parties re	ates and the C same divisio NO side? Wester parties, exclu	n? - (See Local i	Rule
Do <u>all</u> Massa 40.1(d) If filling yes, su	chusetts ( ).  A.  B.  a Notice of the second of the secon	"governmental agencies"), residing in If yes, in which division do_all of the Eastern Division  If no, in which division do the major agencies, residing in Massachuser Eastern Division  Of Removal - are there any motions penparate sheet identifying the motions)	e non-governmental Central Division ity of the plaintiffs of tts reside? Central Division	united stated in the YES parties record the only	wester g the attentio	n? - (See Local i	Rule